

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISS/ODNER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,622	09/26/2003	Yoshiki Fujimura	0001494/2215USU	8062
7590 06/17/2010 Charles N. J. Ruggiero, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.			EXAMINER	
			HICKS, MICHAEL J	
10th Floor One Landmark Square		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	Stamford, CT 06901-2682		2165	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/17/2010	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/672,622	FUJIMURA, YOSHIKI		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL J. HICKS	2165		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 01 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. 🔀 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. a) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). **AMENDMENTS** 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below): (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Rejection of Claims 3, and 8-11 under USC 112. 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 7. 🔀 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔲 will not be entered, or b) 🔀 will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: \_ Claim(s) rejected: 3, and 8-12. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_ AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 9. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. ☐ Other: . /Neveen Abel-Jalil/ /Michael J Hicks/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165 Examiner, Art Unit 2165

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: As per Applicants arguments that Loen fails to disclose "HTML document data to the user terminal to provide the home page on the user terminal in response to a transmission request of transmitting the HTML document data from the web browser of the user terminal", Examienr respectfully disagrees. Examiner asserts that any "content" of a web page (e.g. a web page written in HTML, as is common to the art and discloses in the background of Loen), which is updated by a remote computer and transmitted to a web browser of a user computer system will be HTML content.

As per Applicants arguments that Loen fails to disclose that the patrol search unit patrols "the mail server, the update computer terminal, the home page data base and the schedule data base in this order" and requires that "the patrolling of the patrol search unit is finished after first one of files is searched", Examiner resprectfully disagrees. As noted in the standing rejection, the scheduling operations found in Loen would allow the user to define any patrol order, including a static patrol order as defined in the argued limitation, and further that that the commands listed on Pages 11-14 of Loen clearly include a Schedule GoTo command which would be operable to jump to the end of the schedule, therefor ending the patrol, upon determining that a first file is searched.

As per Applicants arguemtns that Loen and Davis fail to disclose a home page management server, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner maintains that the IMS disclosed in Davis may be interpreted as the home page management server of the claims when taken in combination with the disclosure of Loen. Examiner In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Examiner believes all arguments directed towards Claim12 to be addressed by the above arguments.

1.